REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application are respectfully requested in view of the RCE submitted herewith and in view of the present Amendment and the following Remarks. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,298,128 to Ramey, et al. ("Ramey") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0041590 to Silberfenig et al. ("Silberfenig"). Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey in view of Silberfenig and U.S. Pat Pub. No. 2002/0138296 to Holmes, Jr. ("Holmes"). Claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 13 have been amended for clarification. After careful review of the claims and references, it is submitted that the claims are in allowable form and therefore, allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a voice message is converted to text data for post-processing research, and subsequently searched based upon a non-numeric search term received after the contact has ended for use in post-processing research (see e.g., p. 14, para. 0050-0051). Claims 2, 3, 4, and 10 have been amended to require non-numeric voice content (see e.g., paragraph 0050, lines 7-10).

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20 have been rejected as obvious over Ramey and Silberfenig. Ramey describes an answering machine for determining a return phone number or address for responding to a message based upon a caller ID or the like obtained from the initial communication. Thus, Ramey simply matches a caller ID or e-mail address to a corresponding stored telephone number, name or address in a different medium to enable a return message in that different medium. The Office Action asserts that Ramey teaches converting voice message information to text data in digitized form citing Col. 4, lines 59-64; Col. 5, lines 15-22, and 53-

7

64; and Col. 6, lines 41-45). However, Ramey in Col. 4, lines 59-64 and Col. 5 does not describe converting to text or packetizing and then converting the packetized data to text using speech recognition as claimed. Rather, Col. 4, lines 59-64 merely describe digitizing a message left by the caller using a coder 106 and DSP108, and storing the digitized message along with the caller ID. There is no description of packetizing, and no description of then converting to text using speech recognition. Similarly, Col. 5, lines 15-22 and 53-64 merely describes storage of the telephone number and names, and caller ID's in a correspondent database, and searching the database for the caller ID number in the database, or a name in an e-mail name field. There is no disclosure of conversion of a voice message to text using speech recognition, or packetizing, and no searching of the stored voice message in post-processing to find key words. The Office Action also asserts that Ramey teaches displaying caller ID names on a display device, and thus the displayed information is text that must be converted from voice contact information in Col. 6, lines 41-45. However, Col. 6, lines 41-45 merely describe displaying a list of names stored in an email name list, these are not names converted to text from a voice message. The assumption in the Office Action that displayed information is converted from voice is not true. The telephone number and caller ID are not the voice message and do not need to be digitized, and cannot be converted to text by speech recognition. Thus, this passage does not describe converting the voice message to text or displaying any portion of the voice message. Further, any searching described in search of e-mail names in a database during the call is not post-processing of a database of text converted voice messages to find key words submitted by a searcher after the contact is terminated.

The Office Action also asserts that storing the voice message text data and receiving a search term from a searcher is disclosed by Ramey at Col. 4; lines 62-64 and Col. 5; lines 15-22

and that Ramey at Col. 5 teaches searching a telephone number in a database and that the caller is the searcher supplying the search term. However, Ramey does not store the claimed voice message text data and thus cannot search it. Col. 4, lines 62-64, of Ramey describes an answering machine function which simply records, in digital form, a dictated message from the caller, and also stored caller ID information. As described above, this does not disclose storing the claimed voice message text data which is packetized data converted to text by speech recognition. Col. 5, lines 15-22, describes storing identification information relating to emails, and thus also does not describe storing the claimed voice message text data. These passages also do not describe storing for post-processing research as claimed. Thus, Ramey fails to disclose these claimed features of storing the voice message text data of past voice contacts for post-processing research.

The Office Action also asserts that Ramey at Col. 6, lines 53-64 teaches the claimed receiving a non-numeric search term for a post contact search and searching the voice message text data in Col. 5, lines 53-64. However, Ramey at Col. 5, lines 53-64 merely describes automatically matching a caller ID with names during a contact, no search term is supplied by a searcher nor is it subsequent to the contact for the post-processing research as claimed. The original caller is clearly not the searcher, the search in Ramey is conducted by the system to identify an address, etc. based upon a caller ID automatically extracted from the telephone system without the caller participation or knowledge. The caller also does not provide anything subsequent to the contact or for post-processing research, and the caller ID is not a non-numeric keyword and not received from a searcher conducting a post-contact search. Further, the data base searched in Ramey is not a repository of voice message text data of voice information of post voice contacts. It is a correspondent database containing caller or e-mail ID information and

related attributes not stored voice information in text form from past contacts (Col. 5, lines 23-42). Thus, Col. 5 merely describes searching for a match to a caller ID in the correspondent database of caller ID information but not searching a data repository of voice message text data, (i.e., packetized voice information converted to text data using speech recognition thereby making the voice message searchable by word search). Thus, Ramey does not teach numerous elements of the independent claims 1, 9, and 13. Silberfenig, which concerns a cellular telephone with a voice message recorder, also fails to disclose the above features.

The Office Action concedes that Ramey does not teach converting the packetized data to text using speech recognition but asserts that Silberfenig does at p. 5, paragraph 0048, and Fig. 5. Ramey merely records a voice message in digital form, which does not suggest or make obvious the conversion of speech text or the advantage provided of allowing subsequent search of the spoken content of the voice message for post-contact research. Nor is the caller ID displayed converted from the voice message, it is non-voice data supplied by the network. Further, Silberfenig merely describes a combination cellular phone and voice recorder that can send the message to an email address. Paragraph 0048 describes sending a voice recording to a central computer, which converts it to text for transmission to an email recipient. There is no suggestion to use the speech recognition to convert packetized data to text for storage and subsequent research. Thus, there is no reason to combine Silberfenig with Ramey, and if done does not produce the claimed system.

Together, the combination of Ramey and Silberfenig fail to provide any teaching or suggestion of packetizing and converting a voice message to text, a search term supplied by a searcher subsequent to the contact for post-processing research, or searching the data repository of textized voice data of past contacts. Similarly, Holmes, Jr. fails to provide any teaching or

10

suggestion of the above described features. Since the combination fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of these claim elements, the independent claims 1, 9, and 13 are believed to be distinguishable over all the cited references. Further, dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-20 have believed to be allowable because they depend from allowable base claims 1, 9, and 13.

Claims 7 and 19 have also been rejected as obvious over Ramey and Silberfenig and in view of Holmes. As discussed above, Ramey and Silberfenig do not disclose several claimed features of base claims 1 and 13. In addition, Holmes is cited as teaching that the agent logs onto the ACD. However, the claims 7 and 19 call for "activating the plug-in for the agent when the agent logs onto the...system". Holmes in the cited paragraph 0075 mentions agent logging on, but does not describe activating a message conversion and storage plug-in when the agent logs on. Thus, Holmes does not describe this claimed feature. For this reason, claims 7 and 19 are believed to be further distinguishable over the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, extension of time fee, RCE fee, petition fee, extra claims fee, extra claims fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal,

11

or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ

By: _____
James A. Scheer, Esq.
Registration No. 29,434

</div>

Dated: March 12, 2010

**HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ**
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500 phone
(312) 655-1501 fax